



\$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% *Judgment delivered on: 15.07.2025*+ **W.P.(CRL) 1360/2025**

ANIL VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Javed Ahmad with Ms.
Monika, Advocates along with
petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V Khatri, ASC
(Crl) for State.
Ms. Aakriti Aditya, Advocate
for R-2 and R-2 in person.

CORAM:**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA****JUDGMENT****DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J**

1. By way of the instant petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of FIR bearing no. 154/2025, registered at Police Station Prashant Vihar, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Section 69/351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS') on basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner and respondent no. 2 had been in a close relationship for the past 15 years and had started residing together in a live-in relationship since



January 2019. During the course of their relationship, the petitioner had repeatedly assured respondent no. 2 that he would marry her upon the finalisation of his divorce from his legally wedded wife. Relying upon these assurances, respondent no. 2 continued to cohabit with the petitioner. It is stated that the second motion for divorce of the petitioner was scheduled to be filed in May 2025. However, prior to that, certain misunderstandings and disputes arose between the parties, following which the present complaint came to be filed by respondent no. 2, alleging misconduct on the part of the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the present FIR has arisen out of a personal and private dispute between the petitioner and respondent no. 2, who were in a consensual relationship for the past 15 years and had been residing together as husband and wife since 2019. It is submitted that the FIR was registered due to a misunderstanding and certain emotional and medical difficulties faced by the complainant at the relevant time. It is further submitted that the matter has now been amicably resolved between the parties and the complainant does not wish to pursue the case any further. It is also submitted that continuation of the present criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would amount to an abuse of the process of law, particularly in view of the fact that the dispute is personal in nature and no public interest is involved. It is thus prayed that the present FIR registered, and all proceedings arising therefrom, be quashed in the interest of justice.

4. The complainant, who is present in Court today, states that the



complaint was filed due to a misunderstanding and that she had been experiencing certain medical challenges at the time. She submits that she and the petitioner had been in a relationship for the past 15 years and had been living together as husband and wife since 2019. She further states that even the residents of the locality recognise them as a married couple. However, it is not disputed that the petitioner is legally married and has not yet obtained a divorce from his wife, although he has not been residing with her for several years. In view of the above, and as she no longer wishes to pursue the present case, she prays that the FIR registered under Sections 69 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, be quashed.

5. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the petition and submits that the FIR in question was registered on serious allegations made by the complainant, including forceful physical relations, mental harassment, and exploitation under a false promise of marriage, as well as cheating by the present petitioner. The learned APP argues that such compromises in cases involving allegations of sexual exploitation undermine the seriousness of the offence and dilute the legal safeguards available to women under the criminal justice system. It is therefore submitted that the petition seeking quashing of the FIR be dismissed.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused, on the other hand, submits that no fruitful purpose would be served by continuing with the investigation or subjecting the parties to trial, particularly when the complainant herself has appeared before this Court and



expressed her desire not to pursue the present case. It is contended that the parties had been in a long-standing relationship and the complaint arose due to certain misunderstandings, which have now been resolved amicably. The learned counsel further argues that the continuance of criminal proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law and serve no real ends of justice.

7. This Court has **heard** arguments on behalf of both the parties as well as the respondent no. 2 and gone through the material available on record.

8. After hearing the parties and carefully perusing the case file, this Court is of the considered view that the complainant has candidly stated that the present complaint was lodged at a time when she was undergoing certain medical and emotional challenges. While this explanation has been duly noted, it is equally important to emphasise that the lodging of a complaint under Sections 69 and 351(2) of the BNS, 2023, involving serious allegations of physical assault and wrongful restraint, cannot be permitted to be filed in a casual or reckless manner. Such allegations carry grave consequences and impact not only the accused but also the administration of justice.

9. At the same time, this Court cannot lose sight of the fact that if a person has been falsely implicated or if the allegations have arisen out of a genuine misunderstanding, then compelling such a person to undergo the trial would be contrary to the very principles of fairness and justice. In such circumstances, the continuation of criminal proceedings, despite the unwillingness of the complainant to pursue



them and the subsequent settlement between the parties, would serve no useful purpose and would rather amount to an abuse of the process of law.

10. Considering that the complainant, who is present before this Court, has stated that she is a major and has been in a consensual relationship with the petitioner for a considerable period of time, and that they have been living together as husband and wife and are known as such in the locality for the past four years, this Court finds merit in her request to quash the FIR. However, at the same time, taking into account that the complainant admits to having lodged the present complaint under some misunderstanding, despite being in a longstanding relationship with the petitioner, this Court is of the view that the process of law cannot be invoked casually or without due consideration.

11. Accordingly, while the FIR is ordered to be quashed in view of the settlement and the statement of the complainant, a cost of ₹20,000/- is imposed upon the complainant for initiating criminal proceedings which she now admits were based on a misunderstanding and for setting the criminal law machinery in motion despite having voluntarily been in a relationship with the petitioner. This cost shall be deposited with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee within four weeks from today.

12. Accordingly, the FIR bearing no. 154/2025, registered at Police Station Prashant Vihar, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Section 69/351(2) of BNS and consequential



proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

13. The judgment be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

JULY 15, 2025/vc/zp